



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/580,863	05/26/2006	Kazuhiko Obae	1830.1023	7076
21171	7590	04/02/2009	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			KRISHNAN, GANAPATHY	
SUITE 700				
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			1623	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/02/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/580,863	OBAE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ganapathy Krishnan	1623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 May 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/08; 05/07.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Written Description

Claims 9 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The instant claims are directed to a method of making beta glucan derivatives wherein the bond between the beta glucan and the non-reducing sugar is an ester bond.

The MPEP states that for a generic claim, the genus can be adequately described if the disclosure presents a sufficient number of representative species that encompass the genus. See MPEP § 2163. If the genus has a substantial variance, the disclosure must describe a sufficient variety of species to reflect the variation within that genus. See MPEP § 2163. Although the MPEP does not define what constitute a sufficient number of representative species, the courts have indicated what do not constitute a representative number of species to adequately describe a broad genus. In *Gostelli*, the courts determined that the disclosure of two chemical compounds within a subgenus did not describe that subgenus. *In re Gostelli*, 872, F.2d at 1012, 10 USPQ2d

at 1618. Additionally, in *Carnegie Mellon University v. Hoffman-La Roche Inc.*, Nos. 07-1266, - 1267 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 8, 2008), the Federal Circuit affirmed that a claim to a genus described in functional terms was not supported by the specification's disclosure of species that were not representative of the entire genus. Furthermore, for a broad generic claim, the specification must provide adequate written description to identify the genus of the claim. In *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co.* the court stated:

"A written description of an invention involving a chemical genus, like a description of a chemical species, 'requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, [or] chemical name,' of the claimed subject matter sufficient to distinguish it from other materials." *Fiers*, 984 F.2d at 1171, 25 USPQ2d 1601; *In re Smythe*, 480 F.2d 1376, 1383, 178 USPQ 279, 284985 (CCPA 1973) ("In other cases, particularly but not necessarily, chemical cases, where there is unpredictability in performance of certain species or subcombinations other than those specifically enumerated, one skilled in the art may be found not to have been placed in possession of a genus ...") *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 43 USPQ2d 1398.

The claims are rejected under the written description requirement for failing to disclose beta-glucan derivatives having a non-reducing sugar attached via an ester bond.

The Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications under the 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, "Written Description" Requirement", published at Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pp. 1099-1111 outline the method of analysis of claims to determine whether adequate written description is present. The first step is to determine what the claim as a whole covers, i.e., discussion of the full scope of the claim. Second, the application should be fully reviewed to understand how applicant provides support for the claimed invention including each element and/or step, i.e., compare the scope of the claim with the scope of the description. Third, determine whether the applicant was in possession of the claimed invention as a whole at the time of filing. This should include the following considerations: (1) actual reduction to practice,

(2) disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas, (3) sufficient relevant identifying characteristics such as complete structure, partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties and functional characteristics when coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, (4) method of making the claimed invention, (5) level of skill and knowledge in the art and (6) predictability of the art. For claims 1-13 and 42, each of these factors has been considered, with the most relevant factors discussed below. For each claim drawn to a genus, each of these factors is to be considered to determine whether there is disclosure of a representative number of species that would lead one skilled in the art to conclude that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention. Where skill and knowledge in the art is high, adequate written description would require fewer species to be disclosed than in an art where little is known; further, more species would need to be disclosed to provide adequate written description for a highly variable genus.

First, what do the claims as a whole cover? The instant claims are directed to a beta-glucan derivative having beta-glucan residues and a non-reducing sugar residue chemically attached to the beta glucan residue via an ester bond.

Second, how does the scope of the claims compare to the scope of the disclosure? The genus is claimed broader than what is supported in the disclosure. The claims are drawn to a beta-glucan derivative having beta-glucan residues and a non-reducing sugar residue chemically attached to the beta glucan residue via an ether and ester bond.

Third, the factors need to be considered, with the most relevant factors discussed below.

Reduction to Practice: The only beta-glucan derivative having beta-glucan residues and a non-reducing sugar residue chemically attached to the beta glucan residue is the one that is attached via an ether bond.

Disclosure of Drawings or Structural Chemical Formulas: The only disclosure, in addition to the glucose residues via an ether bond reduced to practice, is in the form of lists of other possible bond types like ester which the disclosed method of making can also be applied to. A list of disclosure of every possible species does not constitute a written description of every species in a genus because it would not “reasonably lead” those skilled in the art to any particular species. MPEP 2163.I.A. and *Fujikawa v. Wattanasin*, 93 F. 3d 1559, 1571, 39 USPQ2d 1895, 1905 (Fed. Cir. 1996). Therefore, there is no disclosure of species (e.g. by disclosure of structural/chemical formulae) in addition to the product having an ether bond, which was reduced to practice.

Method of Making the Claimed Invention: The disclosure only provides a method for making glucose residues to which fructose (non-reducing sugar) is attached via en ether bond. There is no example wherein the product obtained has an ester bond.

Level of Skill in the Art and Knowledge in the Art: The level of skill in the art is that of a scientist with several years of experience in organic synthesis.

Thus, having analyzed the claims with regard to the Written Description guidelines, it is clear that the specification does not disclose a representative number of species for a product that has an ester bond. Thus, one skilled in the art would be lead to conclude that Applicant was not in possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-14, 16, 18 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kobayashi et al (Int. J. Biol. Macromol. 1995, 17(6), 373-79).

Kobayashi et al teach a beta glucan oligosaccharide wherein four glucose residues are chemically attached to the fifth sugar unit, a non-reducing sugar, via an ether bond (page 375, Scheme 4, the oligosaccharide in the middle). The fifth sugar moiety on the right of the chain has a OMe (methoxy) group at the anomeric carbon, which cannot open up to reveal an aldehyde or a ketone that would reduce Fehlings solution. This teaching of Kobayashi is seen to meet the limitations of the said instant claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 4, 6, 8, 15, 17, 19 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al (Int. J. Biol. Macromol. 1995, 17(6), 373-79) in view of Koki et al (EP 0470331).

Kobayashi's teaching is as above. In addition to the above, Kobayashi teaches the transfer of a non-reducing sugar to an oligosaccharide having beta-glucan residues via the action of an enzyme. Kobayashi, however, does not teach the transfer of a fructosyl group and the use of beta-fructofuranosidase enzyme for the transfer in his process.

Koki et al, drawn to fructose containing oligosaccharides, teach the use of beta-fructofuranosidase enzyme for the transfer of the fructosyl group to mono and oligosaccharides (see page 2, lines 55-57 and Examples). The enzyme can be used to transfer the fructosyl group to various kinds of mono- and oligosaccharides in the presence of sucrose.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the beta glucan derivatives and their pharmaceutical compositions as instantly claimed via the method as instantly claimed since such a process using an enzyme is seen to be taught in the prior art using analogous oligosaccharides and non-reducing sugars.

One of skill in the art would be motivated to make the beta glucans and the pharmaceuticals as instantly claimed since the process taught by the prior art is efficient and very specific for the transfer of the fructosyl group using fructofuranosidase and has broad receptor specificity as taught by Koki et al (page 2, lines 55-57), This would allow for the transfer of a non-reducing sugar to different types of residues via a mild process. One of skill in the art would expect the process to work for other oligosaccharides and would want to make polysaccharide and oligosaccharides and their compositions since they are taught to be useful glycosides that have physiological activities (Koki, page 2, lines 1-9) and their potential as polymeric drugs and biomaterials (Kobayashi, page 373, left column, second paragraph). The use of enzymes also gives stereo and region control which are hard to achieve using conventional methods (Kobayashi page 373, left column, second paragraph). It is well within the skill level of the artisan to extend this method for making several different oligo and polysaccharides.

Conclusion

Claims 1-25 are rejected

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ganapathy Krishnan whose telephone number is 571-272-0654. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shaojia A. Jiang can be reached on 571-272-0627. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Shaojia Anna Jiang/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1623

/Ganapathy Krishnan/
Examiner, Art Unit 1623